



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

International relations of the United States. [The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science, vol. LIV, whole no. 143.] (Philadelphia: American Academy of Political and Social Science, 1914. 309 p. \$1.00)

This number of the *Annals* of the academy contains thirty-eight addresses, papers, and letters on certain phases of our foreign policy. These contributions are arranged under four heads: the present status of the Monroe doctrine, Mexican problems and the corresponding obligations of the United States, the policy of the United States in the Pacific, and the elements of a constructive American foreign policy.

Since it is obviously impossible to discuss all these articles in this review, the reviewer will merely indicate the salient features of some of them. In an article entitled "A constructive peace policy for America," Mr. J. P. Norton proposes that the United States, Russia, and China should form a new triple alliance, and suggests that the United States should establish a protectorate over Mexico and Central America. In impressive words Jiuji G. Kasai declares that Japan expected a different sort of treatment from the United States in regard to the agrarian problem in California. He asks: "Will America, that has proudly watched the growth of the island empire during the last half century, now turn to be a *provocateur* to wound eternally the heart of the nation heretofore filled with the deepest gratitude?" While discussing the policy of the United States in the Pacific, Mr. E. C. Stowell presents the view that there is a clash of interests between the United States and Japan: he declares that the two fundamental principles of an American policy towards the Orient are the "exclusion of Asiatic immigrants," and the "open door in China."

The scope and the limits of our obligations towards Mexico are discussed by Mr. L. S. Rowe. He presents a trenchant criticism of President Wilson's Mexican policy — a policy which was "dictated by a lofty idealism." Pointedly he declares that when the United States attempts to dictate the terms of political activity in Mexico, it is arrogating to itself a power which "cannot help but arouse resentment." At the same time he maintains that it is our manifest duty to insist upon the reestablishment of order in Mexico, so far as this comports with a respect for her sovereignty. He quotes with approval the statement of the *Speculator* that "Wilson tried to dictate to Huerta while pretending that Mexico was a free and independent country." Few students of Mexican history and politics will gainsay the remark that the people of the United States should be grateful to President Wilson "for the determined stand that he has taken against armed intervention." Still, Mr. Rowe main-

tains that the present anarchical conditions which prevail in Mexico "must be brought to a close or conditions will arise which will make armed intervention inevitable." The former ambassador of the United States to Mexico, Henry Lane Wilson, contributes an illuminating article concerning recent events in Mexico. He discusses Diaz, Madero, and Huerta, and enumerates the mistakes, which, in his opinion, the government of the United States made in dealing with President Huerta. Some of these errors were: the "announcement of the new doctrine that governments owing their origin to violence would not be recognized" by the United States; and the "refusal to recognize the provisional government of General Huerta." Ex-ambassador Wilson's statement in regard to the circumstances surrounding the mysterious death of Madero is worthy of special notice: "The embassy's investigations brought no certain conclusions except to indicate that General Huerta was in no way privy to the killing to Madero, but that it was his well-defined purpose to send him out of the country." In a most interesting fashion, Mr. A. B. Hart states some "Postulates of the Mexican situation." He declares that there is "no constitutional or international reason why at present anybody must be recognized in Mexico. It would have been well for the world if earlier administrations had been less hasty in recognizing dictators whose careers were destined to be short." One will seek far before finding a better statement of the dilemma with regard to intervention than this: "A stroke of the pen can send an army into Mexico. How many strokes of the sword will be needed to keep it there?"

About one hundred pages of the *Annals* are occupied by material concerning the Monroe doctrine. Here one may read about "the Canning myth," the "Latin" view of the doctrine, the European conceptions of that "international impertinence," the attitude of South America towards it, and the present status of that elusive doctrine announced by President Monroe. Mr. John Barrett, the director of the Pan-American Union, declares that the Monroe doctrine "will continue to be a great *international* principle only to the degree that it is evolved" into a "greater Pan-American policy." Mr. J. H. Latané declares that the doctrine of Monroe is "merely a name that Americans have given for ninety years to our Latin-American policy, which in the necessity of things has undergone changes and will continue to undergo them." In these pages one may indeed find expressed many varying conceptions of the scope and the future influence of that famous doctrine, which some publicists, at least, still consider a cardinal principle of American foreign policy.

WILLIAM SPENCE ROBERTSON